

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/651,498	08/30/2000	JOHN T. DEVLIN	MIO-0071-PA	1401	
7590 02/10/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
KILLWORTH GOTTMAN HAGAN & SCHAEFF L L P			KACKAR	KACKAR, RAM N	
ONE DAYTON	I CENTRE				
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DAYTON, OH	I 45402-2023		1763		

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				mr-
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/651,498	DEVLIN ET AL.09651498	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Ram N Kackar	1763	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
THE - External after - If the - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by seply received by the Office later than three months after the ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thir ririod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	4 January 2004.		
2a)□	<u> </u>	This action is non-final.	•	
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und			
Disposit	ion of Claims			
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 36,39-42 and 44-46 is/are pendin 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 36,39-42 and 44-46 is/are rejected Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.		
Applicati	ion Papers			
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exar	niner.		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) □ objected to	by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	- ,		
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co The oath or declaration is objected to by th).
•	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
=			2 440(a) (d) az (b)	÷
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been ireau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a	iist of the certified copies not	received.	
	•			
Attachmen	• •			
2) Notice 3) Information	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE of No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the RCE dated 1/14/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In this instance the limitation of "upper and lower ends of said heat regulating element are open to said substantially cylindrical heat regulation void from said lower spindle area to said upper spindle area" is not supported by the specification. The specification does not clearly indicate the opening at the bottom of the heat-regulating element, since it discloses a ring support at the bottom (Fig 2-51) and also shows the gas profile from the side and none at the bottom (Fig 2-53 and 59).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1763

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4 Claims 36 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto et al (US 5762709) in view of Yoshio Kimura (US 5578127).

Sugimoto et al disclose a spin coating apparatus disclosing a heat regulating element (Fig 2-50), a cylindrical heat regulation void to accommodate an object (Fig 2-1a) and a circumferential gas flow path (Fig 2-30), a temperature sensor in gas flow path (Fig 3-58a), rotary drive motor, rotary drive spindle (Fig 2-1b, 1) exhaust gas profile (Fig 5 F) and a wafer support (Fig 2 W).

Sugimoto et al do not disclose the regulating frame with fluid inlet and outlet and an additional heat-regulating flange attached to the drive motor.

Yoshio Kimura discloses a heat regulating flange (Fig 2-31b), a rotary drive motor (31) attached to a rotary spindle extending through flange body (31a), liquid source coupled to the fluid conduit (33), a controller coupled to the liquid source (fig 2-36 and Col 5 line 17-19 and line 42-50), programmed (Col 5 line 42-50) to be responsive to a signal from a temperature sensor proximate the rotary spindle passage and fluid conduit (Arrow connected to 36) so as to control temperature of flange by controlling the temperature of the fluid (Col 4 line 47-50) and a rotatable wafer support (28).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to replace external air flow temperature adjustment unit of Sugimoto by a water jacket around the gas flow enclosure (30) like the one Yoshio Kimura discloses around the

Art Unit: 1763

rotary spindle in order to have more efficient and less expensive temperature control system and additionally to have a heat regulation flange (as disclosed in Fig 2) to prevent heat conduction from the motor to the wafer.

Claims 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto et al (US 5762709) in view of Yoshio Kimura (US 5578127) as applied to claim 36 and further in view of Hayes (US 6107608).

Sugimoto et al or Yoshio Kimura discloses temperature control (Fig 2) but do not expressly disclose the location of the temperature sensor.

Hayes discloses a similar heat-regulating flange where the temperature sensor is embedded in it (Fig 7-38 and Col 5 line 47-48).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to embed the temperature sensor so as to have a stable temperature sensing and close feed back control of temperature for the spin chuck.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed 1/14/04 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Sugimoto does not disclose a second fluid conduit and does not disclose the interaction of the exhaust gas flow path traveling through conduit 30 to this fluid.

Since rejection is based upon the combination of Sugimoto and Kimura and not on Sugimoto alone this argument cannot be persuasive. Sugimoto discloses the need of the temperature control of the gas profile and discloses quite an elaborate way of doing this. Kimura discloses a simpler and cheaper alternative of direct heat exchange by using fluid conduit all

Art Unit: 1763

around. Using the combination would have been obvious and would have resulted in the invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N Kackar whose telephone number is 571 272 1436. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on 571 272 1439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SUIT TOWN MILLS
SUIT OF THE TOWNSHER
TEXACOLOGY CONTAR TVCO

RK